



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY-DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/324,511	06/03/1999	HARUHISA SUZUKI	35.G2398	1647

5514 7590 03/13/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

O CONNOR, GERALD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/324,511

Applicant(s)  
Suzuki et al.

Examiner  
O'Connor

Art Unit  
3627



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on December 9, 2002 (Amdt "C")
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-58 and 66-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 22-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 66-75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

Art Unit: 3627

<sup>v</sup>  
**DETAILED ACTION**

*Preliminary Remarks*

1. This Office action has been prepared in response to the amendment and arguments filed by applicant on December 9, 2002 (Paper N<sup>o</sup> 16), in response to the prior Office action.
2. The amendment of claims 66, 68, and 70 by applicant in Paper N<sup>o</sup> 16 is hereby acknowledged.
3. The addition of claims 72-75 by applicant in Paper N<sup>o</sup> 16 is hereby acknowledged.
4. Claims 22-58 remain pending, but continue to stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper N<sup>o</sup> 6.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3627

6. Claims 66-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art, as described in the “Background of the Invention” section from page 1, line 16, to page 3, line 16, of the written specification, it being deemed inherent that the service center(s), service provider(s), and user(s) would have telephones, and an ordinary telephone is considered a terminal connected to a network.

The admitted prior art, though, does not specifically disclose, nor would it reasonably be considered inherent that it would *necessarily* include, any means for performing the recited steps of calculating, nor any means for transmitting images to the terminal.

However, calculators are notoriously well known, hence, obvious devices to use for performing mathematical calculations. In addition, fax machines are also notoriously well known, hence, obvious devices to connect to a telephone network in order to transmit images over the network.

It is noted that the invention, as *claimed*, though not precluding a computer, fails to require a computer, even though a computer is disclosed as being an integral part of the instant invention (a fax machine being an image terminal connected to a network). Although applicant’s remarks and amendment concede that the previous prior art rejection of the previous claims as clearly anticipated by the admitted prior art was valid, and applicant’s amendment is responsive to that rejection and overcomes that rejection, applicant’s amended claims still fail to require a computer in the manner disclosed.

Art Unit: 3627

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the conventional means of performing the claimed method so as to use a calculator for performing the claimed steps of calculating and a fax machine for performing the claimed steps of transmitting images over the network, in order to reduce the time required to perform the method, thereby improving the efficiency of performing the method, simply as a matter of design choice, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed December 9, 2002 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

8. The arguments regarding the previous prior art rejections have been considered, but have been rendered moot by the new grounds of rejection, set forth hereinabove, necessitated by applicant's amendment responsive to the previous prior art rejection and sufficient to overcome the previous prior art rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the disclosure.

Art Unit: 3627

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated any new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication, or earlier communications, should be directed to the examiner, Jerry O'Connor, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1525, and whose facsimile number is (703) 746-3976.

GJOC



March 10, 2003



RENA DYE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
A.U. 3627  
3/12/03